

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

September 4, 2007

7:00 P.M.

Present: Chairman Clark Jenkins, Vice-Chairman Tom Smith, Beth Holbrook, Dave Badham, Ray Keller, Michael Allen, City Council Representative Barbara Holt, City Attorney Russell Mahan, City Engineer Paul Rowland, Planning Director Aric Jensen, and Recording Secretary Connie Feil.

Clark Jenkins welcomed all those present. Ray Keller made a motion to approve the minutes for August 21, 2007 as written. Beth Holbrook seconded the motion and voting was unanimous.

1. Consider an amended site plan approval for Orchard Drive Business Complex located at 2084 S. Orchard Drive, Matt Carter, applicant.

Aric Jensen explained that Mr. Carter is requesting an amended site plan approval for the Orchard Drive Business and Condo Complex. This project was granted final approval earlier this year and now Mr. Carter and his design team would like to reorient the office building in order to provide better views for the proposed townhouse owners and for the residents on Penman Lane.

The proposed revision will simply rotate the building to an east-west configuration which will minimize the view impact. The footprint of the building will change slightly so there will be a full or partial third story, but it will have the same square footage and the same number of parking stalls as originally approved. The building needs to be shifted about 2 feet to the west of the location shown so that it is at least 20 feet from the inside edge of the sidewalk. The townhouse portion of the project will remain unchanged.

Staff recommends amended site plan approval for the Orchard Drive Business and Condo Complex with the following conditions:

1. All of the original conditions of approval still apply
2. Shift office building to achieve 20' setback from interior edge of existing sidewalk as shown on site plan.
3. The applicant shall provide a final landscape plan prior to occupancy permit on any structure.

After a brief discussion Dave Badham made a motion to recommend to the City Council amended site plan approval for Orchard Drive Business Complex located at 2084 S. Orchard Drive as outlined by Staff. Barbara Holt seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor.

2. PUBLIC HEARING-Consider preliminary approval for Thunder Mountain Plat B

subdivision located at approximately 20 N. Moss Hill Dr., Keith & Mark Eubank, applicants.

Keith Eubank, applicant, was present. Paul Rowland explained that this proposed 1 lot subdivision is located on the west side of Moss Hill Drive (1500 East) at the north end of the existing paved street. The ground included in the subdivision contains just under 0.5 acres and is the very east portion of a larger piece of ground currently owned by Mark Eubank, who lives on the west side of the property. The proposal is to subdivide the ground in phases, with this phase consisting of extending 1500 East Street one lot further north and recording that one lot. Because there is not a good turnaround at the end of 1500 East, a temporary turnaround will be provided until the full extension of 1500 East is completed. The Street Master Plan shows the extension of 1500 East northward tying into 400 North/Bountiful Blvd. The next phase of Thunder Mountain Subdivision or the development of the Ralph Keller property to the east will necessitate this extension.

The proposed subdivision is located in an R-3 zone designation which requires 11,000 square feet per lot with 80 feet of frontage at the required setback. This proposed lot easily meets these requirements with over 14,000 sf and 120 ft of frontage. The property slopes from east to west and the street will be constructed at about the same grade of 2% as the existing dirt road.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission send a favorable recommendation for preliminary subdivision approval of the Thunder Mountain Subdivision Plat B with the following conditions:

1. Design of the public improvements to meet Bountiful City Standards including sidewalk and curb and gutter on both sides of 1500 South.
2. A temporary turn-around be constructed as shown on the preliminary plat.
3. All requirements of the City Ordinances be met in the preparation of the final construction plans and the Final Plat.

Keith Eubank mentioned that Ralph Keller has given a verbal agreement indicating that Mr. Eubank would pay for all improvements. It was also agreed that if Mr. Keller sold or developed his side of the easement he would reimburse Mr. Eubank for his half of the costs.

Russell Mahan suggested that an additional condition be made to require Mr. Keller to submit written approval for improvements on his half of the property.

The public hearing was opened for all those with comments and concerns. The public hearing was closed without comments.

There was a discussion regarding the location for the utilities being stubbed in and the temporary cul-de-sac which will be large enough for garbage and snow removal trucks to turn around.

Tom Smith made a motion to recommend to the City Council preliminary approval for Thunder Mountain Plat B subdivision subject to the conditions outlined by Staff and the addition of the following:

4. Written approval by Ralph Keller for the construction of improvements on his half of the right-of-way and his signature on the plat.

Ray Keller seconded the motion and voting was unanimous.

3. PUBLIC HEARING-consider preliminary and final condominium plat located at 1175 S. 200 W., Daniel Gillette, applicant.

Daniel Gillette, applicant, was present. Paul Rowland explained that Mr. Gillette is requesting approval for the conversion of his four unit apartment building into a four unit condominium complex. Located on the east side of 200 West at 1175 South, the current apartments have four covered parking spaces and five more uncovered spaces. This provides 2.25 parking stalls per unit. The site is 13,200 square feet in area with about 6,125 sf of landscaping or about 46% of the total area.

While the complex may not meet the current requirements for parking, it exists as a legal development and simply changing the type of ownership is not grounds to require a physical modification of the property under our ordinances.

Staff recommends preliminary and final condominium plat approval for Brickyard Condominiums with the following conditions:

1. Minor correction to the condo plat and submission of a complete mylar plat.
2. Provide a current title report.
3. Payment of the following fees.

Storm Water Impact Fee	0.303 acres at \$2,400.00/acre	= \$727.20
Engineering Checking Fee	4 Units at \$100/unit	= 400.00
Recording Fee	2 sheets at \$50/sheet	= <u>100.00</u>
		\$1,227.20

The public hearing was opened for all those with comments and concerns.

Lois Aste, residing at 1125 S. 200 W., would like to know what is happening with the property.

Russell Manan explained that the only change will be a change of ownership. Rather than Mr. Gillette owning the units and renting them, he will convert them to condos and sell each unit.

The public hearing was closed without further comments.

After a brief discussion Michael Allen made a motion to recommend to the City Council preliminary and final subdivision approval for Brickyard Condominium conversion subject to the conditions outlined by Staff. Tom Smith seconded the motion and voting was unanimous.

4. PUBLIC HEARING-Consider a variance to allow a circular driveway located at 3796 S. Bountiful Blvd., John Coles, applicant.

John Coles, applicant, was present. Aric Jensen distributed to the Commissioners pictures demonstrating the driveway widths, vehicle turning paths and lane widths as in AASHTO standards. Mr. Jensen explained that Mr. Coles is requesting a variance from various provisions of the City Land Use Ordinance for a circular driveway that he constructed that does not meet minimum standards. Several months ago the applicant hired a contractor to remove his existing drive approach, a portion of his existing driveway, a section of landscaping in the front yard, and a portion of the City curb, gutter and sidewalk located approximately forty feet to the north of the existing drive approach. The contractor then poured a new drive approach and a circular driveway located only 5 feet from the sidewalk that varies between 11 feet and 8 feet 9 inches wide, and that terminates where the curb, gutter and sidewalk used to exist on the north side. Mr. Coles obtained a permit after the fact, but was only granted approval for the one drive approach. At his own risk, and without city approval, the applicant constructed a substandard circular driveway and removed the City improvements. Based on the plans submitted and verification by Staff, 60% of the applicant's front yard is currently in concrete. The driveway does not meet the city standards that are established on construction for this type of driveway. Staff feels that this has created a safety hazard and is a liability to the City.

Bountiful City Ordinance requires an approved permit for any work within a public right-of-way. Drive approaches, curbs and gutters, and sidewalks must be built to specific city standards and must be inspected after forming and prior to pouring to verify proper base material and concrete thickness. As discussed in a recent Planning Commission meeting, the Bountiful City minimum driveway widths are based on AASHTO standards for minimum vehicle turning paths and lane widths. Regardless of the outcome of the Commission's decision, staff may require that any work done without a permit be removed and reconstructed.

The following is a conforming copy of Utah Code 10-9a-702, which outlines the duties of the appeal authority in relation to variances (underlining added to indicate necessary findings for approval):

10-9a-702. Variances.

- (1) Any person or entity desiring a waiver or modification of the requirements of a land use ordinance as applied to a parcel of property that he owns, leases, or in which he holds some other beneficial interest may apply to the applicable appeal authority for a variance from the terms of the ordinance.
- (2) (a) The appeal authority may grant a variance only if:
 - (i) literal enforcement of the ordinance would cause an unreasonable hardship for

- the applicant that is not necessary to carry out the general purpose of the land use ordinances;
- (ii) there are special circumstances attached to the property that do not generally apply to other properties in the same zone;
- (iii) granting the variance is essential to the enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same zone;
- (iv) the variance will not substantially affect the general plan and will not be contrary to the public interest; and
- (v) the spirit of the land use ordinance is observed and substantial justice done.
- (b) (i) In determining whether or not enforcement of the land use ordinance would cause unreasonable hardship under Subsection (2)(a), the appeal authority may not find an unreasonable hardship unless the alleged hardship:
 - (A) is located on or associated with the property for which the variance is sought; and
 - (B) comes from circumstances peculiar to the property, not from conditions that are general to the neighborhood.
- (ii) In determining whether or not enforcement of the land use ordinance would cause unreasonable hardship under Subsection (2)(a), the appeal authority may not find an unreasonable hardship if the hardship is self-imposed or economic.
- (c) In determining whether or not there are special circumstances attached to the property under Subsection (2)(a), the appeal authority may find that special circumstances exist only if the special circumstances:
 - (i) relate to the hardship complained of; and
 - (ii) deprive the property of privileges granted to other properties in the same zone.
- (3) The applicant shall bear the burden of proving that all of the conditions justifying a variance have been met.
- (4) Variances run with the land.
- (5) The appeal authority may not grant a use variance.
- (6) In granting a variance, the appeal authority may impose additional requirements on the applicant that will:
 - (a) mitigate any harmful affects of the variance; or
 - (b) serve the purpose of the standard or requirement that is waived or modified.

In regards to Section 10-9a-707 (2)(a)(i - v), Staff's opinion is that the petitioner has not shown that he meets all of the necessary criteria such that the Commission may grant a variance. First, literal enforcement of the ordinance would not create an unreasonable hardship that is not necessary to carry out the general purpose of the zoning ordinance, i.e., Virtually every traffic safety manual, including AASHTO, states that is in the best interest of pedestrian safety and traffic flow to limit the number of vehicle access points to the absolute minimum necessary. A single family home, which typically generates 10 vehicle trips per day, does not justify two access points.

Second, the applicant already has a two car garage and a parking pad wide enough for three vehicles. One of the purposes of the maximum 50% front yard pavement requirement is to prevent property owners from turning their front yards in to parking lots. The applicant currently

has 5 off-street parking stalls, and so if the ordinance were literally enforced he would still have substantial off-street parking.

Third, there are not special circumstances which apply to this property that do not apply to all other properties in the neighborhood. The applicant states that his property is located at the top of a hill and that visibility is reduced to the point that it is unsafe to back out onto Bountiful Blvd. A review of the aerial photo shows that all of the other properties located along this section of Bountiful Blvd, which are exposed to the same conditions, have driveways that require backing out onto the street. Furthermore, a review of the Bountiful City annual traffic reports from 2004 to present indicate only one reported accident along this stretch of road.

Fourth, allowing the applicant to fill his front yard with concrete and to build a substandard turn-around would be a substantial injustice to the general public and the surrounding neighbors who would have to look at the property and walk on the sidewalk. Approving the requested variance is clearly contrary to the spirit of the Ordinance which is primarily to protect the general health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Bountiful, and secondarily to protect property values.

Lastly, in regards to Section 10-9a-707 (2)(b - c), the hardship is both a self-created and an economic hardship. The desire for additional off-street parking spaces above and beyond the existing 5 spaces and for a secondary drive access is a self created hardship because the applicant already has a primary access to his property that is larger than the minimum required by Ordinance. Furthermore, the fact that the applicant has already poured the circular drive and would have to remove it if his petition is denied is a self created economic hardship. It was at his own risk that he had the work performed prior to obtaining approval.

Driveway approaches are normally reviewed and approved by the Bountiful City Engineering Department, and so the Commission cannot approve the actual permit or site plan, but only a variance or variances from certain provisions of the Zoning Ordinance based on the site plan submitted. The Planning Commission may vote to approve the request in its entirety, to approve the request with modifications, continue the item for further discussion, or to deny the request depending on its findings.

Staff recommends based on the findings discussed in this report, that the Planning Commission deny the request for variance from the Land-Use Ordinance in order to:

1. Construct a circular driveway closer than the minimum 20' depth
2. Construct a driveway narrower than the minimum 12' width
3. Exceed the maximum 50% hard surfacing provision within a required front yard setback

John Coles gave a visual presentation with an explanation for the replacement of the existing drive approach, existing driveway, a section of landscaping in the front yard, and a portion of the curb, gutter and sidewalk. Mr. Coles also presented pictures showing other homes in Bountiful

with circular driveways. Mr. Coles feels that there is limited visibility backing out onto Bountiful Blvd. because his home is on the apex of the hill. The circular drive will not be used for parking, only used as a turnaround to prevent backing out onto Bountiful Blvd. Mr. Coles feels that the circular driveway is a safer solution to enter onto a very busy street. Mr. Coles also feels that his application does meet all the criteria outlined by the State.

The public hearing was opened for all those will comments and concerns.

Richard VonWeller, residing at 3812 S. Bountiful Blvd., feels that living on this street is a traffic hazard. The cars traveling on Bountiful Blvd. are in excess of the speed limit. Mr. VonWeller is in favor of granting the variance. If permitted, Mr. VonWeller would like to ask for the same consideration for his home.

Ann VonWeller, is also in favor of the variance for the same reasons as spoken.

Carol Coles, co-applicant, can't understand why this request would be denied. She feels it is for the safety of her family and the final project will look nice.

Mr. Jensen explained that the pictures presented by Mr. Coles show existing circular driveways on homes with a frontyard setback of at 30 ft, not 20 ft. which gives a larger arc to the driveway. Mr. Jensen mentioned that if the homes were built within the last 1½ years, then they were built to the current code. If they were built prior to that they were built to the code at that time.

Mr. Coles disagreed with Mr. Jensen's comments.

The public hearing was closed without further comments.

There was a lengthy discussion in regards to the ability of Mr. Coles to safely back onto the circular driveway before entering onto Bountiful Blvd. The discussion also included the criteria set by State Law in order to grant a variance. The Planning Commission decided to visit the site before making a final decision. A date of September 18, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. was set for an on-site field trip.

Dave Badham made a motion to table this item until after the field trip has been made. Beth Holbrook seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor.

5. PUBLIC HEARING-Consider a zone change from R-4 to RM-13 located at 375 E. 400 N., Kevin Menlove, applicant.

Kevin Menlove, applicant, was present. Aric Jensen explained that Mr. Menlove, representing himself and other property owners, is requesting a zone map amendment from R-4 to RM-13 (Residential Multi-Family) for several parcels of property located on the north side of 400 North between 275 East and 400 East (Orchard Dr.), and for the existing Colonial Garden

Condominiums.

Mr. Menlove is the owner of just the property at 375 East 400 North, which contains an existing dilapidated single family home. His proposal is to tear down the home and build a duplex or twin home on the site. The structure located on the property to the east at 383 East is an existing non-conforming duplex that was illegally converted to a triplex, but then was converted back to a duplex after City intervention. Changing the zoning could potentially facilitate the rehabilitation of these properties. The owner of 408 North 275 East has petitioned to be part of the rezone. Staff does not support the inclusion of this property as it does not face onto 400 North. Colonial Garden Condominiums is an existing development and so rezoning it to RM-13 would simply change it from a non-conforming use to a conforming use.

Mr. Jensen continued to explain that 400 North is a very wide right-of-way with 2 lanes of traffic in both directions. It is improved with a landscape median, street parking, and both sidewalks and parkstrips, which mitigates much of the undesirable effects. This is unlike the section of 400 North west of Main Street, which is clearly undesirable for single family homes. On its own, the condition of 400 North is not enough to warrant a zone change.

Rezoning these few properties does have Staff concerned that establishing a section of multi-family zoning along 400 East will encourage other surrounding property owners with large lots to petition for rezone to multi-family. While the General Plan wouldn't support those changes, it may not be wise to crack open Pandora's box even slightly.

The public hearing was opened for all those with comments and concerns.

Kay Barlow, residing at 290 E. 400 N., has no objections to rezoning 375 E. & 383 E. 400 N., but not the other proposed homes. The two homes at 375 E. & 383 E. need to be replaced.

Tom Tolman, residing at 585 N. 400 E., agrees with Mr. Barlow in regards to the two homes being torn down. Mr. Tolman feels that this area is a single family area and should remain as single family. Mr. Tolman has concerns with other property owners changing the zoning to allow for more multi-family.

Andrea Bushing, residing at 360 E. 400 N., does not want any more apartments in this area. Ms. Bushing had concerns with 383 E. 400 N. being out of compliance and allowed to have a duplex. Mr. Jensen explained that when 383 E. was converted to a duplex the zone allowed for it. The same situation occurred with Colonial Gardens.

Janet Gold, residing at 400 N. 400 E., asked if the property is going to be sold or rezoned and could they build a duplex. Mr. Menlove explained that he is waiting for re-zone approval before a decision can be made.

Glen Gold, residing at 400 N. 400 E., has no objections to the rezone. Property taxes in

Bountiful have gotten so high his children will not be able to afford a home. Allowing apartments or townhomes will allow for young couples to afford housing.

The public hearing was closed with no further comments.

There was a lengthy discussion. The general consensus was that changing the zoning designation to multi-family this far east was bad policy and might start an undesirable trend. The Planning Commission and City Council has enacted ordinances limiting the development of multi-family uses in this area of town, and this request seems contrary to those decisions.

Barbara Holt made a motion to recommend denial of the zone change from R-4 to RM-13. Tom Smith seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor.

After the vote, the Commission and the applicant discussed the applicants' options for presenting this proposal to the City Council. The applicant did not definitively say whether or not he would challenge the Planning Commission's recommendation.

6. Consider amendments to Title 14, Land Use Ordinance.

Aric Jensen explained that at the August 21st Planning Commission meeting, the members voted to bring back new language regarding illegal uses, assisted living centers, and minimum property size for Planned Developments. Mr. Jensen continued that Staff has drafted language for illegal uses that would be easy for all to understand. There are essentially two parts to the language: First, language saying that it is illegal to change a use or to market a use without getting City permission, and second, that anyone marketing a property has to declare the zoning on all signs and literature.

Russell Mahan presented the following proposal for Illegal Use Language:

Illegal Change of Use.

Any person, individual, corporation, or other party that changes the use of a structure or property to a use not permitted by current City ordinances, without first obtaining required re-zoning, variance or other use approvals from the City, is guilty of a class C misdemeanor.

False Representation.

Any person, individual, corporation, or other party that, for purpose of selling or leasing real property, represents either orally or in writing that a property or structure has a lawful use when in fact that use is unlawful under current City ordinances, is guilty of a Class C misdemeanor. This includes real estate agents and any other persons engaged in the marketing of a property.

Zoning Disclosure Required.

Any seller, lessor, or any person representing a seller or lessor of real property, shall disclose in a prominent location on any sign, listing, or other promotional material, the zoning designation of the subject property given on the current official zoning map of the City. This disclosure shall include both the zone map classification and the zone name, i.e., R-4, Single Family Residential.

Tom Sheffield and Carry Smith, residents living in an area of great concern with illegal apartments, thanked Staff for the time and effort put into creating an ordinance to protect their neighborhood.

Mr. Jensen continued the discussion regarding PUDs. The Commission members felt that one acre was too small to effectively create a planned development with open space, clustering, and other amenities. They were also concerned that such a small threshold would result in “crammed unit developments” instead of truly planned unit developments.

Regarding assisted living in the Commercial zone, the Commission agreed that assisted living uses, especially as an “air space” use over commercial, were compatible uses and could enhance retail sales. However, they agreed with Staff that simply allowing assisted living as a permitted or conditional use in the Commercial zone could result in prime commercial areas being developed into non-revenue generating uses. The consensus was that this use needed to be approved using a zoning method that allowed a case by case review, such as rezone to the Mixed-Use zone.

After a lengthy discussion the Commission chose to recommend approval for the proposed language for illegal uses. The Commission chose not to recommend decreasing the minimum PUD size or to allow assisted living throughout the Commercial zone without a case by case review such as a Mixed-Use zone.

Clark Jenkins made a motion to recommend to the City Council approval of the amendments to Title 14, Land Use Ordinance, as discussed. Tom Smith seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor.

8. Consider preliminary and final site plan approval for 172 & 184 E. 500 S., Marv Blossch, applicant.

Aric Jensen explained that Mr. Blossch is requesting preliminary and final site plan approval for two professional office buildings located at 172 East and 184 East 500 South. The subject properties contain an existing duplex and a single family dwelling, and were part of the recent rezone along 500 South to the PO-N zone.

The site plan is in keeping with the goal of improving the appearance and functionality of 500 South. The project consists of a shared parking lot located behind the dwelling structures with a shared driveway replacing three existing driveways. The site plan shows 2368 sq ft on the main level of the structures, and 2262 sq ft in the basements. Due to the age and construction of the homes, and current building code and ADA access requirements, the project architect estimates that less than 75 percent of the basement space can be improved as office space. The rest could potentially be used as storage space or simply left unimproved. There will be approximately 4100 sq ft of gross office space or less, which at 1 stall per 300 sq ft, translates to 14 (13.7) stalls. The project currently contains 15 stalls, one of which is ADA accessible.

There is already existing landscaping on the site, however, the applicant will need to provide an updated landscaping plan based on the proposed changes to the site.

The concept plan showed a retention basin in the southwest corner of the parking lot and the existing grade naturally flows to the northwest, and so the City Engineer and the project engineer concur that it is better to eliminate the retention basin and simply sheet flow the storm water to the street. Mr. Blossch will need to pay a storm water fee of \$3,400 per acre, or approximately \$1,260 for this 0.372 acre site.

Mr. Blossch is proposing covered porches on the rear of the structures and a dumpster with a solid enclosure will be located in the southeast corner of the parking lot.

Staff recommends preliminary and final site plan approval for 172 East and 184 East 500 South with the conditions that the applicant pay the required storm water fee and provide an updated landscaping plan meeting staff's satisfaction.

After a brief discussion Tom Smith made a motion to recommend to the City Council preliminary and final Professional Office site plan approval for 172 & 184 E. 500 S. subject to the conditions outlined by Staff. Ray Keller seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor.

9. Consider preliminary and final sign package approval for Renaissance Towne Centre located at 1500 S. Main, Bruce Broadhead, applicant.

Bruce Broadhead, applicant, was present. Aric Jensen explained that Bountiful City Ordinance 14-18-112 B. requires that all multi-tenant centers submit a sign package to the Planning Commission for its review and approval if the property is larger than 5 acres in size. The Commission has wide discretion in what it can and cannot approve. The following is an excerpt taken from the sign ordinance:

In cases with parcels of land of 5 acres or larger, and with frontage of 300 feet or more, a proposal for the overall design and placement of all on-premise signs shall be submitted. Such signs may vary from the regulations set forth herein and shall

be considered as a conditional use for existing projects, or as a condition of site plan approval for new projects. This provision does not grant the applicant any expectation of approval of any sign that differs from the requirements of this Title, rather it allows the City the ability to approve signing schemes appropriate to the scale and impact of a project. The approving body must determine that the proposed sign exceptions are not in conflict with the purpose and intent of this Chapter, are in harmony with the general plan and surrounding development, and are appropriate to the scale and impact of the project.

Mr. Jensen explained that Mr. Broadhead is proposing a sign standard for Renaissance Towne Centre. There are only two items that are out of the ordinary: one is the proposed pole sign, which is larger than any other thing currently constructed in Bountiful, and the second is the projecting medical directory sign to be located on the parking structure.

Bruce Broadhead explained that the proposal is to establish guidelines and regulations for signage at the Renaissance Towne Centre development, a mixed-used, multi-tenant development that consists of over 5 acres of land with frontage of 300 feet or more. This policy is to create an environment that produces maximum traffic and promotes the greatest sales for all tenants in Renaissance Towne Centre development.

Mr. Jensen reviewed the proposed Renaissance Towne Centre Sign Policy with the Commission, Staff and Mr. Broadhead, (a copy of which is attached to these minutes). There was a lengthy discussion regarding the directory signs, monument signs, and freestanding signs. The Commission emphasized the disapproval of reader board signs in this zone.

Clark Jenkins made a motion to approve the sign proposal for Renaissance Towne Centre without the reader board sign provision and eliminating the directory sign on the parking structure. Tom Smith seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 pm